DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 335 073 JC 910 361

AUTHOR Torres, Belinda M.; Kapes, Jerome T.

TITLE The Relationship between Work Values and Job Satisfaction for Black and Hispanic Community College and Technical Institute Leadership Trainees.

PUB DATE 3 Dec 90

NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Vocational Association (Cincinnati, OH, November 30-December 4, 1990).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Statistical Data (110) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Qualifications; *Blacks; College Administration; Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; *Hispanic Americans; Instructional Leadership; *Job Satisfaction; Leadership Qualities; *Leadership Training; Statistical Analysis; Tables (Data); Technical Institutes; Two Year Colleges; *Values

ABSTRACT

In 1990, a study was conducted to identify the work values and degree of job satisfaction of potential minority leaders in community colleges and technical institutes, and to examine the relationship between participation in a minority leadership development program and work values and job satisfaction. The study sample was drawn from an applicant pool of 73 individuals who were nominated for the Texas A & M Minority Leadership Development Project (MLDP). Though only 37 were selected for participation in the MLDP, all 73 nominees were invited to participate in the study. Characteristics of the potential minority leaders were studied using biographical data, two measures of work values, and a job satisfaction instrument. Major study findings included the following: (1) study subjects differed from norm groups on selected work values, appearing to value ability utilization, advancement, aesthetics, altruism, authority, creativity, personal development, social interaction, variety, working conditions, cultural identity, economic security, compensation, social status, supervision/human relations, and supervision/technical more highly; (2) those selected for participation in the MLDP valued advancement, responsibility, and autonomy more highly than those not selected for the MLDP, but valued physical activity, social interaction, social relations, variety, working conditions, cultural identity, physical prowess, activity, independence, and co-workers less than those not selected; (3) those selected for the MLDP were less satisfied with their current job than those not selected; and (4) the Values Scale appeared to be a better measure than the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire of work values that related to job satisfaction among the potential minority leaders. A discussion of implications, a 12-item bibliography, and 9 data tables are included. (JMC)

ED385073

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN WORK VALUES AND JOB SATISFACTION FOR BLACK AND HISPANIC COMMUNITY COLLEGE AND TECHNICAL INSTITUTE LEADERSHIP TRAINEES.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Torres

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Belinda M. Torres
Research Associate
Industrial, Vocational and Technical Education
Texas A&M University

and

Jerome T. Kapes
Professor
Educational Psychology
Texas A&M University

Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting
of the American Vocational Association
December 3, 1990
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Running Head: Values/Satisfaction

JC 910 361

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Introduction

Minorities, specifically Blacks and Hispanics, have been traditionally excluded from or are underrepresented in administrative positions in colleges and universities (Bernstein, 1984; Garza, 1984; Harvard, 1986; Rivera, 1983; and Tinsley, 1985). Also, minority leadership is a subject that remains largely unexplored (National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987).

During the late 1960's, leadership development programs were established in an effort to bring more minorities into the mainstream of American society and its educational institutions. National and state studies on the degree of minority participation in higher education have revealed that leadership programs focus on the development of higher educational management skills, not on learning about the characteristics of minority leaders. Also the programs are seldom evaluted during and/or after the training (Willie, 1984).

In a study, Today's Academic Leaders in Community and Junior Colleges by Moore (1985), it was found that 92% of the administrative were White, 6% were Black, and 2% were Hispanic. This data clearly shows that minority administrators are underrepresented in community college administrative positions. While research studies on women in two-year college administrative positions are scarce, there are even less studies on minority two-year college administrators (Moore, 1985).

Minority administrative leadership in the two-year college is clearly a subject worthy of additional research. Within the last 30 to 40 years, community colleges have expanded their traditional function to include the interests and needs of the wider community (Barrera, 1984). They have attracted a more diverse population than the traditional university-bound student and serve people of more varied ages, background, ethnicity, and educational goals.

Faculty and administrative positions in community colleges need to be staffed by individuals reflecting the ethnic background of the students. Statistics illustrate that although community colleges have large percentages of minority students, neither administrative staff nor faculty reflect the percentages of these minorities (Garza, 1984).

Leadership development programs may train potential minority adminsitrators, but research needs to be conducted on leadership development programs for minorities to identify the characteristics of potential leaders. While this research could be accomplished in a wide variety of ways, one approach would be to use measures of values to profile potential minority leaders. Values are important factors in determining individual behavior and choices. More specifically, work values are important determinants of occupational choice and future goals (Super, 1970). An assessment of work values could provide useful information about why potential minority leaders choose a certain work environment. This information could also be used to

encourage minorities to enter and/or advance in leadership positions within post-secondary vocational education.

Job satisfaction is assessed by measuring a worker's level of satisfaction with various job aspects or facets (Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist (1967). Both intrinsic and extrinsic factors are considered in the measurement of job satisfaction. What is known and learned about the job satisfaction of potential minority leaders could be used to change those factors within a job that can be changed, or for helping individuals accomodate those factors that are less subject to change.

This purpose of this research was to identify the work values and degree of job satisfaction of potential minority leaders in community colleges and technical institutes. In addition, the study examined participation in a minority leadership development program, as well as important moderator variables, as they impacted work values and job satisfaction.

It was the purpose of this research to answer the following questions:

1) What are the work values and current job satisfaction of potential minority leaders?
2) How do work values and job satisfaction differ when potential minority leaders are compared on the demographic variables of ethnicity, gender, professional experience, level of education, and participation in a minority leadership development program?

3)What is the relationship between work values and job satisfaction for potential minority community college leaders?

4)What combinations of work values and demographic variables account for the maximum variance in job satisfaction?

Method

Population and Sample

The population of interest in this research was Black and Hispanic educators who are considered potential leaders in community college settings in Texas. The sample was drawn from the applicant pool for the Texas A&M Minority Leadership Development Project (MLDP).

Each of the community colleges and technical institutes in Texas, by campus, were given an opportunity to nominate two individuals to participate in the leadership project. There were approximately 73 individuals nominated and 37 were selected for participation in the leadership training. All 73 nominees were included in the study. The subjects in the selected group were nominated and are currently participating in the Texas A&M MLDP. The subjects in the non-selected group were nominated but not selected to participate in the leadership project. Selection was based on the following criteria: completed application, three letters of recommendation, and completion of two essay questions on leadership.

Instrumentation

Characteristics of the potential minority leaders were

studied using biographical data, two measures of work values, and a job satisfaction instrument. The Demographic Information Sheet (DIS) was used to acquire self-report of the subject's ethnity, gender, number of years of professional experience, and level of education. The Values Scale (VS) and the ranked form of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ) were utilized as measures of work values. The long form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) was utilized as the measure of job satisfaction.

The VS, which was developed out of the Work Importance Study by Nevill and Super (1981) measures intrinsic and extrinsic values. The instrument was created for national and cross-national use and is appropriate for adults and for studies of career development at various ages and with different cultural groups. Reliability for the VS as measured by the coefficient alpha ranged from .67 to .87 for adults. The VS's validity is supported by data on occupational differences, cultural differences, socialization, and life stages. In addition, factor analyses was conducted across age groups in the United States. The VS uses a 4 point scale which yields 21 separate values. The 21 values are reported in raw scores which can be converted to T T scores with a mean of 50 and standard deviation of 10. The raw scores obtained for each of the 21 values were converted to standard scores using the tables provided in the test manual. The standard scores were based on a sample of adults in the United States.

The MIQ measures an individual's vocational needs and values. A study by Round and Dawis (1975) concluded that the MIQ ranked form profiles are as stable as the paired form profiles. In addition, the ranked form completion time one-half the completion time for the paired form, and subjects usually prefer the ranked form over the paired form. The MIQ is an ipsative instrument requiring sets of five value statements to be ranked. These 21 scales yield a need score which may range from -4.00 to +4.00. The scale range is divided into two regions of importance and unimportance by the zero (0.00) point. While actual MIQ scores fall within the range of -1.00 to +3.00, the MIQ reports 0.00 as the median point. For this study, two points were added to the scores for each scale and the new score was then multipled by ten. By doing this, the negative numbers and decimal points were eliminated. This made the new zero point equal to 20 (0.00 + 2 X 10 = 20), the lowest score available equal to 10 (equivalent to -1.00), and the highest score equal to 50 (equivalent to +3.00). Reliability for the MIQ is presented in terms of internal consistency of scales, the temporal stability of scales, and temporal stability of profiles. The median reliability coefficients for the 21 MIQ scales range from .77 to .81. Internal consistency reliability is reported in the form of Hoyt reliability coefficients which range from .30 to .95. Test-retest correlations, based on two-week to ten-month intervals range from .53 to .89. Various types of validity information is available on the MIQ based on over 30 years of

research. For example, the 21 scales of the MIQ have been shown to discriminate among nine occupational groups.

The MSQ assesses an employee's job satisfaction in 20 job related areas. It measures actual satisfaction with a reinforcer whereas the MIQ measures the importance of a reinforcer to the individual. The authors of the Manual for the MSQ (Weiss, Dawis, England, & Lofquist, 1967) recommend using the long form since the 15-20 minutes required to complete the instrument is a relatively short period of time and it provides more information than the short form. The MSQ uses a 5 point Likert scale for 100 items with five items representing each of the 20 scale scores. The total general satisfaction score (which uses one item from each of the 20 factors and can range from 20 to 100) and all 20 scale scores were used in this study. The long form of the MSQ has reliability coefficients ranging from .59 to .97, and has been validated by numerous research studies.

Research Design and Procedure

The instruments were administered to the 37 selected participants during the July 1989 Summer Institute of the Texas A&M MLDP. Although there were 37 individuals, 36 chose to take part in the study and one chose the option of not participating. The 36 non-selected individuals were contacted by telephone, informed of the purpose of the study, and asked to respond to the instruments by the mail. The instruments were mailed to the non-selected group with a cover letter explaining the procedures for completing the instruments. The instruments were mailed four

weeks after the selected group data was collected. Telephone follow-up was used to ensure participation in the study. The response rate for the NS group was 100%, with $\underline{N}$ = 36.

To answer question 1, descriptive statistics were used to create a profile of the work values and the current level of job satisfaction. Means and standard deviation for all variables are provided.

To answer question 2, all work values and the job satisfaction measure were related to the moderator variables of participation in the leadership project, ethnicity, gender, professional experience, and level of education using t-tests or correlations.

To answer question 3, correlation coefficients were computed between each work value and each MSQ scale score.

To answer question 4, a general linear model was used to determine the amount of variance accounted for in the dependent variables using the moderator and values variables.

Results

Question 1 concerned the work values and job satisfaction for the minority sample under study. The data necessary to answer this question is provided in the first column of Tables 1, 2, and 3. From Table 1, which reports the results for the Values

---

Insert Tables 1, 2, and 3 about here

Scale (VS), it can be seen that all of the values were responded

to as above average in importance since all the scores are above the T mean score of 50. Those values which are equal to or greater than a .5 standard deviation over the mean (T = 55) are marked in the table with a + sign. Using this criteria, 12 of the 21 values could be considered high. The 12 highest values in ascending order are: Cultural Identity, Advancement, Creativity, Aesthetics, Authority, Economic Security, Working Conditions, Personal Development, Variety, Altruism, Ability Utilization, and Social Interaction.

The results of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (MIQ) analysis are reported in Table 2. From the table, it can be seen that the range in values is much greater than was observed for the VS. This occurred largely because the MIQ is an ipsative instrument which forces some scores down in order for other scores to be high. Using a score of 30 or greater to denote importance, 11 important values can be observed. Using a criteria of .5 standard deviation over the male norms for ages 26 to 45 from the test manual, the following five values appear to be most important: Compensation, Authority, Social Status, Supervision-Human Relations, and Supervision-Technical.

Table 3 shows the results for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ). Using the criterion of a .5 standard deviation over the test-manual norms for employed non-disabled adults, the following four needs appear to be more satisfied for this sample: Authority, Social Service, Social Status, and Working Conditions. In absolute terms, the five most satisfied

needs for this sample were: Social Service, Moral Values, Achievement, Activity, and Responsibility. The total score for the MSQ also appears at the bottom of Table 3. The score reported (77.7) is approximately equal to the average for employed non-disabled adults ($\bar{X}$ = 77.86).

Question 2 has five parts, the first of which deals with the difference between those who were selected to participate in the MLDP and those who were not. The data for this question is also presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3 in the right hand column. The VS data presented in Table 1 reveals that the two groups differed on only seven of the 21 values and in all cases the selected group had lower values for: Physical Activity, Social Interaction, Social Relations, Variety, Working Conditions, Cultural Identity, and Physical Prowess.

The MIQ data is presented in Table 2 and indicates that the selected group differed from the non-selected group on eight of the 21 values. Of these, the selected group held higher values for Ability Utilization, Advancement, Responsibility, and Autonomy, while the non-selected group valued Activity, Independence, Working Conditions, and Co-Workers more highly.

The MSQ data is presented in Table 5 and indicates that the two groups differed on only seven of the 20 needs satisfied and in all cases the selected group had lower satisfaction for: Advancement, Company Policies and Practices, Creativity, Recognition, Security, Supervision-Human Relations, and Supervision-Technical. The MSQ total general satisfaction

difference between selected and non-selected is also presented at the bottom of Table 3. From the table, it can be seen that the selected group had significantly lower current total job satisfaction.

The second and third parts of question 2 concern ethnic and gender differences on the two work values instruments and on job satisfaction as measured by the MSQ. The first two columns of Tables 4, 5, and 6 contain the data necessary to answer these parts of the question. From an examination of both sets of data

---

Insert Tables 4, 5, and 6 about here

---

in each table, it can be seen that only three of 62 differences exist for the ethnic comparison, while there are six differences in gender comparisons. Given the few differences found in the large number of comparisons, it may be appropriate to conclude that only the three gender differences that exceeded the .01 level should be interpreted as real differences. In these three cases, females scored higher on Ability Utilization (MIQ and MSQ) and Creativity than did males. The MSQ total general satisfaction comparison also yielded no ethnic or gender differences.

The last two parts of question 2 concerned the relationship between the professional experience and level of education of the sample and scores on the two values instruments and the job satisfaction measure. The data for this analysis are presented as Pearson product-moment correlations on the right hand side of

Tables 4, 5, and 6. From the tables, it can be seen that for professional experience only seven of 62 comparisons yielded relationships that exceeded the probability of .05 chance occurrence. None of these were significant for the MSQ and only one (Social Service) has a relationship that is significant at the .01 level. If one choses to interpret these relationships as real, it could be concluded that for this sample (and the population which they represent) there is a tendency for those with greater professional experience to value Advancement, Aesthetics, Altruism, Economic Rewards, Security, Working Conditions, and Social Services more highly.

For the relationship between level of education and values, only four exceeded a .05 chance occurrence. Only Achievement (MIQ and MSQ), which exceeded chance at the .01 level, is likely to represent a real relationship. That is, those who had more education tended to value and be more satisfied with Achievement.

The analysis of the MSQ total general score and its relationship to professional experience and level of education failed to yield statistically significant results.

The third question examines the relationship between each work value and each MSQ scale score. A simple correlational analysis was used to answer this question for the total sample. The relationships between each work value on the VS and MIQ and each MSQ scale are seen in Tables 7 and 8. Because of the large number of relationships examined and because at least some of those found statistically significant could reflect chance

---

Insert Tables 7 and 8 about here

---

number of relationships examined and because at least some of those found statistically significant could reflect chance occurrence, the data in the tables has been displayed in a manner to allow observation of trends in relationships between particular values and corresponding satisfaction. For this purpose, the median correlation between each VS or MIQ scale and all MSQ is reported as the first column in each table. Also, the median correlations between each MSQ and all VS or MIQ scales is reported across the top of each table. The number of significant relationships between each VS or MIQ and all MSQ scales is reported in the last column of the tables, and the total significant relationships between each MSQ scale and all VS or MIQ scales is reported at the bottom of the tables. The criteria of 3 or more significant relationships was arbritarily established as a cutoff to identity values and satisfaction scales with high relationships to each other.

Forty-five of the 420 correlations for the VS and MSQ were found to be statistically significant for this sample at either the .05 or .01 level. Table 7 reveals that for the VS and MSQ there were seven scales on the VS with three or more significant relationships to MSQ scales, and there were nine MSQ scales with three or more significant relationships to VS scales. For the VS and MSQ, the median correlations (r) ranged from -.09 to .21 for

the VS scales and from -.08 to .13 for the MSQ scales. Certain scales, both VS and MSQ, appear to yield more significant relationship than others. For the VS and MSQ, approximately 10% of the intercorrelations are statistically significant, and only eight of the 45 correlations are equal to or greater than .30. The highest correlation is .39 which reflects only (approximatley) 15% shared variance.

The correlations between the VS and MSQ indicate that for the sample under study there are certain values which appear to be related to overall job satisfaction, and conversely, certain satisfactions that appear to be more predictable using the VS. The VS scales that are of importance for predicting job satisfaction for this sample include: Advancement, Aesethetics, Authority, Economic Rewards, Life Style, Social Interaction, and Cultural Identity. The MSQ scales that are predictable using the VS for this sample include: Achievement, Co-Workers, Indepedence, Moral Values, Security, Social Service, Social Status, Supervision-Human Relations, Variety, and Working Conditions.

Table 8 shows the relationship between each MIQ and MSQ scale. Thirty-one of the possible 420 correlations for the MIQ and MSQ were found to be statistically significant for this sample at either the .05 or .01 level. From the table, it can be seen there were five MIQ scales with three or more significant relationships, and there were six MSQ scales with three or more significant relationships. The MIQ and MSQ median correlations

ranged from -.10 to .15 for the MIQ and -.15 to .12 for the MSQ. The highest correlation is .37, which reflects only (approximately) 14% shared variance.

The MIQ values that appear to be related to job satisfaction for the minority candidates include the following: Activity, Independence, Recognition, Moral Values, and Responsibility. The MSQ scales that appear to be more predictable using the MIQ include: Ability Utilization, Achievement, Advancement, Recognition, Social Status, and Supervision-Technical.

In comparing Tables 7 and 8, it appears that certain MSQ scales are more predictable in using work values as measured by either the VS or MIQ. Those scales include Achievement and Social Status. However, there do not appear to be certain values for both the VS and MIQ that have more potential for predicting satisfaction.

The fourth question concerns the combinations of work values and demographic variables that accounted for the maximum variance in job satisfaction. A multiple regression full and stepdown analysis were computed using all work values and demographic variables to predict satisfaction. Table 9 shows the results for the multiple regression analysis.

Insert Table 9 about here

From the table, the number of hits for the dependent variables, (MSQ scales--Abi to TGS) can be seen vertically, while

the number of hits for the independent (VS--AU to ES and MIQ--AU to Aut) and moderator (MLDP to LOE) variables are shown horizontally. The total number of hits observed (with regression coefficients significant > .10) for the independent and moderator variables are shown after the last column. The symbols used to represent the significance level for the hits are described beneath the table.

At the bottom of the table, the first three rows report the multiple regression results for the full 47 variable model, the R^2 adjusted for the expected shrinkage, and the significance of R^2 for the full model. A hyphenated line separates the results for the stepdown analysis. The first row beneath the hypenated line reports the R^2 for the restricted model for each of the dependent variables. The second row (k variables) reports the number of the variables that remained in the stepdown models. The last row reveals that all the restricted models were significant at the .01 level.

It can be seen from the table that the R^2 for the full model ranged from .62 (Moral Values) to .85 (Company Policies & Practices and Working Conditions), while the R^2 adjusted values ranged from .01 (Authority and Security) to .58 (Working Conditions). The majority of the R^2 adjusted values for the full model are not significant, even though they account for a large amount of the variance. Only six of the dependent variables (Ability Utilization), Activity, Company Policies and Practices, Creativity, Responsibility, and Working Conditions)

were found to be yield significant R^2 at the .04, .03, .02 or .01 level in the full model analysis.

For the stepdown models, R^2 restricted values ranged from a low of .38 (Co-Workers) to a high of .85 (Working Conditions). The minimum number of variables necessary for a model is seven (Co-Workers), and the maximum number of variables is 23 (Activity and Working Conditions).

To select the important unique variables that predict satisfaction, a cutoff of 10 or more hits was arbritarily chosen. If the independent variables are examined by group (VS, MIQ, and moderator variables), it can be seen that four of the VS variables had 10 or more hits across the dependent variables. The VS variables with 10 or more hits were: Autonomy, Personal Development, Social Relations, and Variety. For the MIQ variables, only Company Policies and Practices contained 10 or more hits across the dependent variables. As for the moderator variables, MLDP had 16 hits while Gender had 17 hits across the dependent variables. Thus, a total of seven independent and moderator variables appear to be important unique factor related to job satisfaction for the subjects in the study.

Conclusions

The study examined work values and job satisfactin of potential minority leaders with respect to four specific questions. The first question concerned the work values and job satisfaction for the minority sample under study. The minorities who were included in this study differed from norm groups on

selected work values. They appear to value Ability Utilization, Advancement, Aesthetics, Altruism, Authority, Creativity, Personal, Development, Social Interaction, Variety, Working Conditions, Cultural Identity, Economic Security, Compensation, Social Status, Supervision-Human Relations, and Supervision-Technical more highly than the norm groups with which they were compared.

Question two asked how work values and job satisfaction differed when the potential minority leaders were compared on participation in the MLDP, ethnicity, gender, professional experience, and level of education. Although there were was no systematic effort to select participants for the MLDP based on values, the evidence suggests that those selected valued Physical Activity, Social Interaction, Social Relations, Variety, Working Conditions, Cultural Identity, Physical Prowess, Activity, Independence, and Co-Workers less and Advancement, Responsibiity, and Autonomy more than those not selected.

Minorities selected for the MLDP differed from those not selected on current job satisfaction. The data indicate that those selected were less satisfied with their current jobs.

When Black and Hispanic minority candidates for the MLDP were compared on work values they did not appear to differ. When male and female minority candidates for the MLDP were compared on work values they appeared to differ very little. The only difference found was that female candidates valued Ability Utilization and Creativity more than males.

Years of professional experience do not appear to bear any

significant relationship to work values for the minority leadership candidates studied. If there were a relationship, it might be that those with more experience valued Social Service more. Level of education did not appear to be related to work values held by the minority leadership candidates. If any relationship does exist, it may be that those with more education valued Achievement more.

The third question concerned the relationship between each work value and each MSQ scale score. The correlational results for the VS and MSQ revealed that there were certain scales that were related to job satisfaction and certain satisfactions that appear to be more predictable using the VS. The VS values of importance in predicting job satisfaction were Advancement, Aesthetics, Authority, Economic Rewards, Life Style, Social Interaction, and Cultural Identity. The MSQ scales that are most predictable using the VS were Achievement, Co-Workers, Independence, Moral Values, Security, Social Service, Social Status, Supervision-Human Relations, Variety, and Working Conditions.

The correlational results for the MIQ and MSQ revealed that five MIQ values were related to job satisfaction for the sample and six MSQ scales were more predictable using the MIQ. The five MIQ values were Activity, Independence, Recognition, Moral Values, and Responsibility. The six MSQ scales were Ability Utilization, Achievement, Advancement, Recognition, Social Status, and Supervision-Technical.

The overall comparisons betweent the two work values measures and satisfaction indicate that, for this sample, there were no work values that are measured by both the VS and MIQ that yielded high correlations with satisfaction. Conversely, there were two MSQ scales that appear to be predicted by work values. These two scales are Achievement and Social Status.

The final question sought to determine the combinations of work values and demographic variables that accounted for the maximum variance in job satisfaction. The R^2 for the restricted models ranged from .38 (Co-Workers) to .85 (Working Conditions). The restricted models contained between 7 and 23 variables.

The multiple regression stepdown method revealed that there were seven unique important factors related to job satisfaction. Four of the VS variables were able to predict satisfaction on 10 or more of the dependent variables. These VS variables were Autonomy, Personal Development, Social Relations, and Variety. Of the 21 MIQ variables only Company Policies & Practicies was able to predict satisfaction on more than 10 dependent variables. Of the moderator variables, MLDP predicted satisfaction on 16 of the dependent variables, while Gender predicted satisfaction on 17 of the dependent variables. It should be noted that while there were no gender differences found on overall satisfaction, there are apparently a large number of differences on individual satisfiers.

Only one dependent variable, Achievement, was significantly related to all seven unique important independent and moderator

variables. Based on the results of the multiple regression analysis, the VS appears to be better than the MIQ as a measure of work values that are related to the job satisfaction of potential minority leaders.

Implications

The following implications for further research and practice were derived from the relevant literature and the results of the study.

Research

1. The VS and MSQ both appear to be sufficiently reliable and valid to recommend their use in further research with potential minority leaders in community college settings.
2. Given that this study is the first to use these instruments with Black and Hispanic potential minority community college leaders, additional studies of this nature should be undertaken to create a body of knowledge on this topic.
3. To investigate the actual predictive power of work values for job satisfaction with minority leaders in education, additional studies should be undertaken in which work values are measured before entry upon new leadership positions and job satisfaction measured after some time on the job.
4. A longitudinal study of change in work values and job satisfaction over time for minority leaders in community college settings would be useful to discover and increase knowledge about the career development process for this group of professionals.

5. Additional research is needed to explore other variables such as personality, acculturation, self-concept, motivation, occupational interests, and previous unique experiences that might be important predictors of success and satisfaction of potential and existing minority leaders in community college settings.
6. Research studies should be conducted to determine the reliability and validity of all work values and job satisfaction instruments with minorities.

Practice

7. The VS or MIQ, as measures of work values, both demonstrated sufficient reliability and validity to be useful in career counseling with potential minority leaders in community college settings.
8. The MSQ, as a measure of job satisfaction, has sufficient reliability and validity to be useful in career counseling with potential minority leaders in community college settings.
9. Given the overlap between the VS and MIQ and the relatively greater contribution made by the VS to predicting job satisfaction, the VS may be the better instrument for use in career counseling of minority leaders in community college settings when only instrument is desired.
10. To the extent that work values and job satisfaction are important characteristics of potential minority leaders, it appears that programs of leadership development in community

college settings need not be structured differently for participants because of their minority status (Black or Hispanic) or gender.

11. For the purposes of career counseling, counselors as well as clients will be benefit when career assessment instruments report norms based on minority values, interests, and needs.

References

Barrera, M. (1984, May). Hispanics and community colleges. Paper presented at the meeting of the Hispanic Roundtable Meeting, Phoenix, AZ.

Bernstein, A. R. (1984). Foundation support for administrative advancement: a mixed record. In A. Tinsley, C. Secor, and S. Kaplan (Ed's.) Women in Higher Administration. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Carza, M. J. (1984, May). Current staffing patterns. Paper presented at the meeting of the Hispanic Roundtable Meeting, Phoenix, AZ.

Harvard, P. A. (1986, April). Successful behaviors of Black women administrators in higher education: implications for leadership. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Moore, K. M. (1985). Today's academic leaders: a national study of administrator's in community and junior colleges. Pennsylania State University, University Park, Center for the Study of Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 264 927)

National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration (1987). Leaders for America's Schools. University Council for Educational Administration, Tempe, AZ. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 286 265)

Nevill, D. D. and Super, D. (1981). Manual: The Values Scale. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Rivera, M. (1983, November). Hispanic participation in the administration of the California community colleges: 1981-82. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the Association of Mexican American Educators, Fresno, CA.

Rounds, J. B. and Dawis, R. V. (1975). A comparison of the multiple rank order and paired comparison forms of the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire (Research Report No. 49). Minneapolis, MN: Work Adjustment Project.

Super, D. (1970). Manual: Work values inventory. Boston, MA: Houghton-Mifflin.

Tinsley, A. (1986). Upward mobility for women administrators. Journal of National Association of Women, Deans, and Counselors, 3(Fall), pp. 3 - 11.

Weiss, D. J., Dawis, R. V., England, G. W., Lofquist, L. H. (1967). Manual for the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilation (Whole No. XX11).

TABLE 1
Means and Standard Deviations on the Values Scale for Total Sample and Participation Status

	Total		Participation[a]			
			S		NS	
Variable	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Ability Utilization	55.2+	8.2	53.4	9.2	57.1	6.6
Achievement	54.9	8.4	53.2	9.8	56.5	6.6
Advancement	56.8+	8.7	55.5	8.4	58.2	8.9
Aesthetics	56.2+	9.1	55.1	8.7	57.3	9.4
Altruism	55.4+	7.0	54.7	7.3	56.1	6.6
Authority	56.2+	8.6	56.0	8.3	56.4	9.0
Autonomy	52.7	7.8	51.1	8.1	54.4	7.3
Creativity	56.5+	8.1	55.4	8.7	57.5	7.5
Economic Rewards	54.4	9.5	52.5	9.3	56.2	9.4
Life Style	52.1	8.6	50.6	8.2	53.6	8.8
Personal Development	55.7+	8.4	56.0	9.6	55.5	7.2
Physical Activity	54.3	9.3	50.5	8.2	58.2**	8.9
Prestige	53.5	9.5	52.9	10.3	54.1	8.6
Risk	54.1	9.1	52.1	8.2	56.1	9.6
Social Interaction	55.0+	8.7	52.9	7.8	57.1*	9.2
Social Relations	53.1	11.3	46.6	9.3	59.6**	9.4
Variety	55.5+	9.3	51.5	8.1	59.6**	10.0
Working Conditions	55.9+	7.7	53.6	8.7	58.2**	5.5
Cultural Identity	58.3+	8.8	54.1	8.2	62.5**	7.3
Physical Prowess	54.7	12.3	49.0	7.1	60.4**	13.8
Economic Security	56.2+	6.9	54.8	7.4	57.6	6.1

[a]S=Selected, NS=Non-Selected
+ = Differences from adult means greater than .5 standard deviation (T > 55).
Note. Significance level is designated for: * $p < .05$, two-tailed, ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. When a significant difference is noted, the asterisk is placed after the larger mean.

TABLE 2
Means and Standard Deviations on the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire for Total Sample and Participation Status

	Total		Participation[a]			
			S		NS	
Variable	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Ability Utilization	35.7	6.7	37.3*	6.5	34.0	6.5
Achievement	37.7	6.7	38.6	6.7	36.7	6.8
Activity	23.7	8.1	20.7	7.1	26.6**	8.0
Independence	20.8	8.7	18.0	7.1	23.6**	8.5
Variety	25.4	5.9	24.7	5.8	25.2	5.9
Compensation	31.8+	7.5	30.9	7.4	32.7	7.7
Security	31.9	8.5	30.1	7.8	33.6	8.7
Working Conditions	29.4	6.4	27.5	6.4	31.3*	5.9
Advancement	34.2	7.2	36.4**	8.2	32.0	5.4
Recognition	31.6	6.6	32.0	6.9	31.3	6.3
Authority	22.4+	8.5	21.2	8.5	23.8	8.4
Social Status	24.1+	9.0	22.3	8.1	25.9	9.6
Co-Workers	25.6	7.1	23.3	7.0	28.0**	6.4
Social Service	31.1	7.0	30.0	6.5	31.2	7.6
Moral Values	31.5	9.4	32.7	11.0	30.2	7.5
Comp Pol & Practices	30.1	6.6	30.5	7.6	29.7	5.6
Sup--Human Relations	28.6+	5.8	27.9	6.2	29.4	5.3
Sup--Technical	26.3+	5.8	25.5	6.6	27.1	4.9
Creativity	32.3	5.2	32.9	5.3	31.6	5.2
Responsibility	33.1	5.6	34.7*	5.7	31.5	5.2
Autonomy	31.6	7.5	33.8*	6.6	29.5	7.7

[a]S=Selected, NS=Non-Selected
+ = Differences between mean for total group and 50%ile for male norms for ages 26 to 45 exceed .5 standard deviation for MIQ.
Note. Significant level is designated for: * $p < .05$, two-tailed, ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. When a significant difference is noted, the asterisk is placed after the larger mean.

TABLE 3
Means and Standard Deviations on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire for Total Sample and Participation Status

	Total		Participation[a]			
			S		NS	
Variable	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD	$\bar{X}$	SD
Ability Utilization	20.2	3.8	19.4	4.3	21.0	1.9
Achievement	20.6	2.6	20.4	3.2	20.8	2.8
Activity	20.6	2.2	20.9	2.2	20.4	2.2
Advancement	16.2	4.8	14.0	5.2	18.5**	3.3
Authority	19.0+	3.1	14.0	5.2	19.0	2.6
Comp Pol & Practices	17.4	4.1	15.6	4.5	19.1**	2.9
Compensation	16.6	4.3	16.2	4.8	17.1	3.7
Co-Workers	19.9	2.9	19.5	3.3	20.4	2.0
Creativity	19.6	3.3	18.7	4.0	20.5*	2.0
Independence	19.5	2.9	18.8	2.9	20.1	2.7
Moral Values	21.4	2.2	21.6	2.7	21.5	1.9
Recognition	18.0	4.2	16.8	4.5	19.2*	3.6
Responsibility	20.3	2.5	19.8	3.0	20.8	1.8
Security	20.2	3.2	19.4	3.2	21.0*	3.0
Social Service	21.5+	2.3	21.6	2.7	21.5	1.9
Social Status	19.0+	3.1	18.7	3.7	19.4	2.4
Sup--Human Relations	18.6	4.3	17.3	4.8	19.9*	3.2
Sup--Technical	18.3	3.7	17.3	4.3	19.3*	2.7
Variety	19.8	2.9	19.4	3.4	20.2	2.1
Working Conditions	19.7+	4.1	19.0	5.2	20.5	2.5
MSQ[b]	77.7	8.9	74.9	9.5	80.5**	7.2

[a] S = Selected, NS = Non-selected
[b] Mean for MSQ total general satisfaction for employed non-disabled adults is 77.86.
+ = Differences between mean for total group and 50%ile for norms for employed non-disabled adult means greater than .5 standard deviation
Note. Significance level is designated for: * $p < .05$, two-tailed, ** $p < .01$, two-tailed. When a significant difference is noted, the asterisk is placed after the larger mean.

TABLE 4
Means and Standard Deviations for Ethnicity and Gender, and Correlations for Professional Experience and Level of Education on the Values Scale

	Ethnicity[a]		Gender[a]		Professional Experience	Level of Education
Variable	H	B	F	M	r	r
AU	56.9 (5.7)	53.7 (5.7)	55.1 (8.2)	55.4 (8.2)	.12	-.11
Ach	56.0 (6.5)	53.7 (9.9)	54.0 (8.3)	55.7 (8.6)	-.05	-.10
Adv	57.0 (9.4)	56.2 (8.2)	56.6 (6.9)	57.1 (10.3)	.28*	-.03
Aes	56.0 (8.6)	56.4 (9.6)	53.8 (8.4)	58.6* (9.2)	.28*	-.03
Alt	56.0 (6.6)	54.8 (7.4)	55.3 (6.7)	55.5 (7.3)	.25*	.06
Ath	58.3* (6.4)	52.3 (9.9)	57.1 (9.2)	55.3 (7.9)	.03	.07
Aut	53.2 (7.4)	52.3 (8.3)	53.7 (7.5)	51.8 (8.2)	-.01	.22*
Cre	56.7 (6.9)	56.2 (9.2)	57.8 (7.5)	55.1 (8.6)	.03	-.02
Eco	54.7 (9.2)	54.1 (9.8)	55.6 (7.5)	53.1 (11.0)	.23*	.21
Lif	53.9 (8.1)	50.4 (8.9)	53.1 (7.8)	51.1 (9.4)	-.08	.15
Per	56.5 (7.6)	54.9 (9.2)	56.8 (8.5)	54.6 (8.4)	-.01	.10
Phy	55.4 (9.2)	53.2 (9.5)	52.7 (10.4)	56.0 (8.4)	.10	.19
Pre	53.9 (8.9)	53.1 (10.1)	53.5 (9.3)	53.6 (9.8)	-.09	.16
Ris	54.8 (8.9)	53.5 (9.3)	54.4 (10.0)	53.9 (8.1)	.03	-.02
SoI	55.2 (8.3)	54.8 (9.2)	54.3 (8.2)	55.7 (9.3)	.01	-.08
SoR	53.5 (11.3)	52.8 (11.5)	50.6 (11.4)	55.6 (10.8)	.09	.03
Var	57.2 (9.5)	53.9 (10.2)	53.9 (8.5)	57.2 (11.1)	.05	-.03
WoC	55.8 (7.8)	53.9 (7.7)	55.6 (8.1)	56.2 (7.5)	.11	.05
Cul	57.5 (9.4)	59.0 (8.2)	56.8 (7.8)	59.7 (9.6)	.14	.10
Phy	53.3 (12.8)	12.8 (11.8)	54.8 (13.4)	54.6 (11.3)	.02	.06
Eco	56.7 (5.8)	55.6 (7.8)	55.2 (6.1)	57.1 (7.5)	.17	-.01

[a]Means are top numbers, Standard deviations are in parentheses.
* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

TABLE 5
Means and Standard Deviations for Ethnicity and Gender, and Correlations for Professional Experience and Level of Education on the Minnesota Importance Questionaire

	Ethnicity[a]		Gender[a]		Professional Experience	Level of Education
Variable	H	B	F	M	r	r
Abi	36.7 (6.9)	34.7 (6.4)	37.8** (6.9)	33.5 (5.8)	-.06	.06
Ach	38.4 (7.4)	36.9 (6.1)	39.4* (5.8)	36.0 (7.3)	-.02	.29**
Act	24.2 (7.5)	23.2 (8.6)	22.3 (7.3)	25.1 (8.6)	-.01	-.06
Ind	21.7 (7.8)	19.9 (9.6)	19.2 (7.9)	22.4 (9.4)	-.03	-.09
Var	26.2 (5.5)	24.7 (6.2)	24.5 (6.2)	26.4 (5.5)	-.01	-.11
Com	31.8 (8.1)	32.0 (7.0)	31.1 (6.8)	32.6 (8.2)	.01	.02
Sec	31.8 (8.1)	32.0 (9.0)	31.1 (8.9)	32.6 (8.1)	.25*	-.08
WoC	28.0 (7.4)	30.8 (5.0)	29.0 (6.9)	29.8 (5.9)	.23*	.05
Adv	34.2 (7.5)	34.2 (7.1)	35.4 (6.3)	33.0 (8.0)	-.03	.05
Rec	32.0 (6.3)	31.3 (6.9)	30.6 (7.2)	32.6 (5.8)	-.11	.16
Ath	23.4 (7.6)	21.5 (9.3)	20.7 (8.9)	24.2 (7.8)	.01	-.04
SoS	21.8 (9.6)	26.3* (7.8)	23.5 (7.9)	24.7 (10.1)	.02	.09
CoW	25.6 (6.5)	25.7 (7.7)	25.0 (8.3)	26.3 (5.6)	.07	.05
SoS	30.7 (7.3)	31.4 (6.9)	30.7 (7.3)	31.5 (6.7)	.30**	.22*
Mor	31.9 (11.5)	31.0 (6.9)	31.4 (10.3)	31.5 (8.5)	.10	-.10
CoP	30.3 (7.3)	30.1 (6.1)	31.0 (5.4)	29.2 (7.7)	.16	-.15
SHR	29.6 (6.5)	27.7 (5.0)	28.8 (4.7)	28.5 (6.8)	.08	-.07
SuT	25.5 (6.5)	27.0 (5.1)	26.8 (5.4)	26.0 (6.3)	-.01	-.10
Cre	33.2 (6.4)	31.4 (3.6)	34.1** (5.5)	30.4 (4.2)	.01	.21
Res	34.8 (5.5)	31.4 (5.4)	33.8 (6.2)	32.4 (5.0)	-.13	.12
Aut	33.1 (8.0)	30.2 (6.7)	33.1 (6.8)	30.2 (7.9)	-.14	.05

[a]Means are top numbers, Standard Deviations are in parentheses.

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

TABLE 6
Means and Standard Deviations for Ethnicity and Gender, and Correlations for Professional Experience and Level of Education on the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

	Ethnicity[a]		Gender[a]		Professional Experience	Level of Education
Variable	H	B	F	M	r	r
Abi	20.1 (4.7)	20.2 (2.7)	21.4** (2.3)	19.0 (4.5)	-.10	-.06
Ach	20.9 (2.8)	20.4 (2.4)	21.0 (2.5)	20.3 (2.7)	-.06	-.24*
Act	21.3* (2.6)	20.1 (1.9)	21.1 (2.1)	20.2 (2.2)	.08	-.15
Adv	16.5 (5.2)	16.0 (4.5)	16.5 (4.5)	16.0 (5.1)	-.03	.06
Aut	19.0 (3.7)	18.9 (2.5)	19.1 (3.7)	18.9 (2.5)	.12	-.11
CPP	17.0 (4.6)	17.7 (3.7)	18.0 (3.7)	16.7 (4.5)	-.10	-.04
Com	16.2 (4.7)	17.1 (3.9)	17.0 (4.5)	16.3 (4.0)	.06	.07
CoW	19.7 (3.5)	20.1 (2.2)	20.6 (2.6)	19.2 (3.0)	-.03	.14
Cre	19.6 (3.7)	19.6 (2.8)	20.2 (2.9)	19.0 (3.6)	-.15	-.15
Ind	19.2 (3.4)	19.7 (2.3)	19.8 (2.8)	19.2 (3.0)	.07	-.14
MoV	21.6 (2.7)	21.2 (1.7)	21.8 (2.1)	21.0 (2.3)	-.05	-.17
Rec	17.6 (4.6)	18.4 (3.8)	18.9 (3.8)	17.1 (4.4)	-.12	-.21
Res	20.8 (2.7)	19.8 (2.3)	20.6 (2.5)	19.9 (2.5)	-.08	-.18
Sec	20.6 (3.0)	19.8 (3.4)	20.1 (3.0)	20.3 (3.4)	.12	-.07
SSe	21.7 (2.7)	21.4 (1.9)	21.9 (2.0)	21.6 (2.6)	.06	-.13
SSt	19.0 (3.7)	19.1 (2.5)	19.2 (3.3)	18.9 (3.0)	.16	-.15
SHR	17.7 (4.8)	19.5 (3.6)	18.7 (4.8)	18.5 (3.8)	-.08	-.05
SuT	18.0 (3.8)	18.6 (3.6)	18.7 (4.2)	18.0 (3.1)	-.08	.06
Var	20.2 (3.0)	19.4 (2.7)	20.3 (4.2)	19.4 (3.1)	-.04	-.18
WCo	18.8 (4.9)	20.6 (3.1)	20.7* (3.4)	18.8 (4.6)	-.07	-.03
MSQ[b]	77.8 (9.3)	77.7 (8.5)	79.5 (8.5)	76.0 (9.0)	-.08	-.06

[a]Means are top numbers, standard deviations are in parentheses
[b]Mean for MSQ total general comparisons.
* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 7
Correlations between the Values Scale and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

		Values Scale								
		AU	Ach	Act	Adv	Aut	CPP	Com	CoW	Cre
MSQ										
	Med r	.13	.11	.03	-.02	.01	.04	.02	.12	-.02
AU	.07	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ach	-.01	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Adv	-.04	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Aes	.18	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	+	.
Alt	-.03	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Aut	.21	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Aut	-.01	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Cre	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
ER	.11	.	+	.	.	.	.	.	+	.
LS	.15	.	+	#	.	.	.	.	+	+
PD	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
PA	-.09	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Pre	-.03	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ris	.11	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
SI	-.01	.	.	.	.	.	.	-	.	.
SR	.08	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Var	-.05	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
WC	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
CI	.09	.	+	.	.	.	.	.	+	.
PP	.03	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
EC	.05	.	.	-	.	+	.	.	.	.
Total Sig	.05	2	3	2	0	1	0	1	4	1

+ = Positive at .05
# = Positive at .01
- = Negative at .05
= = Negative at .01
. = No significant relationship

Table 7 (continued).

	Values Scale											
MSQ	Ind	MV	Rec	Res	Sec	SSe	SSt	SHR	ST	Var	WC	Total Sig .05
	.12	.16	-.08	-.05	.01	.10	.07	.10	.05	.07	.01	
AU	.	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Ach	.	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2
Adv	.	.	.	.	.	.	-	.	.	-	-	3
Aes	+	.	.	.	+	+	+	#	.	+	#	8
Alt	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Aut	#	.	.	.	.	#	#	#	+	+	+	8
Aut	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Cre	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
ER	.	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3
LS	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	+	.	.	6
PD	.	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	-	2
PA	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Pre	.	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Ris	.	.	.	.	.	+	.	+	.	.	.	2
SI	.	.	-	.	-	.	.	.	.	.	=	4
SR	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Var	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
WC	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
CI	.	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	3
PP	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
EC	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	2
	3	6	1	0	2	3	3	3	2	3	5	

+ = Positive at .05
# = Positive at .01
- = Negative at .05
= = Negative at .01
. = No significant relationship

Table 8
Correlations between the Minnesota Importance Questionnaire and Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire

		Minnesota Importance Questionnaire									
		AU	Ach	Act	Adv	Aut	CPP	Com	CoW	Cre	Ind
MSQ											
	Med r	.01	-.01	.11	.03	.01	.02	-.01	.01	-.03	-.11
AU	.05	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ach	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Act	-.01	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Ind	-.01	-	.	.	#	.	.	.	.	-	.
Var	.05	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	=
Com	.01	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Sec	-.02	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	-	.
WC	.01	.	.	.	.	-	.	.	.	.	.
Adv	.08	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Rec	.11	.	.	.	#	.	.	.	.	.	.
Aut	.06	#	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
SSt	-.01	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
CoW	-.06	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
SSe	-.05	.	#	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
MV	.15	+	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
CPP	.02	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
SHR	-.05	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
ST	-.03	.	-	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Cre	.08	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Res	-.10	.	.	.	.	-	.	.	.	.	#
Aut	-.03	.	.	.	=	.	.	.	.	.	.
Total Sig	.05	4	3	0	3	2	0	0	0	2	2

+ = Positive at .05
# = Positive at .01
- = Negative at .05
= = Negative at .01
. = No Significant Relationship

Table 8 (continued).

	Minnesota Importance Questionnaire										
MSQ	MV	Rec	Res	Sec	SSe	SSt	SHR	ST	Var	WC	Total Sig .05
	-.02	.08	.05	.07	.01	-.15	-.07	.12	.04	-.05	
AU	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Ach	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Act	.	.	.	.	.	-	-	.	.	.	3
Ind	.	+	.	.	.	-	.	.	.	.	5
Var	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Com	.	.	+	.	.	.	.	#	.	.	2
Sec	.	.	.	.	.	-	.	.	.	.	2
WC	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Adv	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	+	.	.	1
Rec	.	#	.	.	.	.	.	#	.	.	3
Aut	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
SSt	.	.	.	.	.	-	.	.	.	.	1
CoW	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
SSe	.	.	.	.	.	-	.	.	.	.	2
MV	.	.	.	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	3
CPP	.	+	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
SHR	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
ST	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
Cre	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	0
Res	.	.	.	.	.	.	=	.	.	.	3
Aut	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	1
	0	3	1	1	0	5	2	3	0	0	

+ = Positive at .05
# = Positive at .01
- = Negative at .05
= = Negative at .01
. = No significant relationship

Table 9
Multiple Regression for Full 47 Variable Model and Dependent Variables

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables								
	AU	Ach	Act	Adv	Aut	CPP	Com	CoW	Cre
AU									
Ach		*							*
Adv		•	**	**					
Aes			*			**			**
Alt	**	**		**					**
Aut	**	**	**		**		**		**
Aut Cre									*
ER			*						*
LS		*	*		*				*
PD	**	**	**	*					**
PA									
Pre Ris	**	**							
SI	*			**					*
SR	**	*	**	*		*			•
Var	**	*	*			**			**
WC	**					**			**
CI									**
PP			**		•				
ES			*		**		**		*
AU				**		**	**		
Ach		*	*						
Act	*					*	*	**	
Ind Var			•		•				*
			•			**		**	
Com Sec	*			**				*	
WC Adv	•				•		•		
Rec Aut				*					
SSt CoW			**		**	*		*	*
SSe MV		*	*			*	•		•
CPP SHR			•		*				
ST Cre	•	**		**	•	**	**	**	
Res Aut	**		**		*	**		•	•
MLDP E		•		**	**		*	*	
G PE			*		*				
LOE	**	**	**		**	**	*		**
			*		*				
						**			
R^2 Full	.81	.71	.80	.75	.65	.85	.63	.68	.79
R^2 Adjusted	.46	.16	.43	.28	.01	.57	.09	.07	.40
Sig of R^2 Full	.02	.26	.02	.12	.53	.01	.67	.40	.03
R^2 Restricted	.69	.59	.69	.64	.56	.75	.41	.38	.73
k variables	15	15	23	13	16	18	9	7	20
Sig of R2 Restricted	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01

• Regression coefficient significant at .10

* Regression coefficient significant at .05

** Regression coefficient significant at .01

Table 9 (continued).

Ind Var's.	Dependent Variables												Σ > .10
	Ind	MV	Rec	Res	Sec	SSe	SSt	SHR	ST	Var	WC	TGS	
AU				**			•				**		1
Ach			*	*							•	*	2
Adv	•		*										6
Aes													5
Alt	**		**			**	*	*	•		*	*	8
Aut	*		*			**	•			**		**	12
Cre													0
EB										•	*		1
LS													4
PD	•	**		**		*	*			*			10
PA			*	**				**				**	9
Pre											**		1
Ris			**			**					*	*	6
SI					**				**	**	**	**	8
SR					*	•				•	**	**	11
Var	•							*		*	*	*	10
WC						*	•					•	6
CI	*										**		3
PP	*	**			**		**	**		**	**		9
ES	**									*			6
AU		**					*						5
Ach					**				**	•			5
Act		•	•	**								**	9
Ind	**				•	**				•	**		8
Var		*	•	**							**	*	8
Com													2
Sec	**				*								3
WC								**	**				4
Adv	*								•		**		4
Rec		*	**							•			7
Aut								**	**	**	•		6
SSt	**			**			**				**		7
CoW		•											3
SSe	*	•									**		6
MV													2
CPP		*	**	*	**		**	**				**	14
SHR				**	*					*	**		9
ST	•	**	*	**							*		7
Cre													6
Res				*					*	*			5
Aut													2
MLDP	**		**	**	**	•	*			**	**	**	16
E				*							*		3
G	**		**	*	*	*	*		•	**	**	**	17
PE	**		*										4
LOE				**			*				•		4
	.75	.62	.73	.79	.66	.70	.63	.69	.67	.64	.85	.75	
	.27	.12	.22	.38	.01	.12	.08	.10	.03	.04	.58	.28	
	.12	.71	.19	.04	.50	.32	.64	.35	.46	.58	.01	.11	
	.59	.46	.73	.79	.66	.70	.63	.69	.67	.64	.85	.75	
	17	10	14	15	11	10	12	7	8	17	23	14	
	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	.01	

• Regression coefficient significant at .10

* Regression coefficient significant at .05

** Regression coefficient significant at .01

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
SEP 06 1991